

cm

122
117.

104

The method of claim 99, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

cm

123
118.

105

The method of claim 100, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

cm

124
119.

106

The method of claim 101, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

cm

125
120.

107

The method of claim 102, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

cm

126
121.

108

The method of claim 103, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

cm

127
122.

109

The method of claim 104, wherein the step of controlling is carried out with the property corresponding to one from a group consisting of a tax-exempt security and a portfolio of tax-exempt securities.

II. REMARKS

The Examiner is requested to reconsider the application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks. It is believed that the amendment adds no new matter.

Respectfully, and generally and for the reasons set forth below, the objections and rejections and each ground therefor are traversed.

A. Paragraphs of Objections and/or Rejections

1. Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 1-

29 have been examined.

In response, Applicant appreciates the examination.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to certain informalities in the specification.

In response, Applicant has implemented the helpful suggestions of the Examiner with the amendment above.

3. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has graciously solicited Applicant's review of the specification to help ensure correction of any errors in the specification.

In response, Applicant has reviewed the specification and has sought to correct further errors in the specification with the amendment above. In this regard, it was observed that the Declaration and Power of Attorney were not precisely clear that the inventor is a sole inventor, and thus a new Declaration and Power of Attorney is being submitted herewith.

4. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has provided courtesy case citations and rules concerning the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. A need to respond to the paragraph has not been indicated, but the courtesy is appreciated.

5. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 on grounds of the judicially created doctrine of double patenting.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed as unjustified, but a Terminal Disclaimer has been filed herewith.

6. Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

In the sixth numbered paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that additional material has been made of record.

In response, Applicant has reviewed the additional material and appreciates the Examiner's search for prior art.

7. Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

In the seventh numbered paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner

A

has offered numerous ways to communicate with the Examiner and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

In response, Applicant appreciates the courteous information. Likewise, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 240-0824 if the prosecution of this case can be in any way advanced by a telephone discussion.

8. Office Communication of November 19, 1999

In the Office Communication of November 19, 1999, the Examiner has objected to the specification and contends that the specification should be double spaced.

In response, a double spaced portion of the specification, as a substitute specification, is provided herewith.

III. CONCLUSION

The application, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is requested. Applicant and the undersigned wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the excellent focus and effort in the examination.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter K. Trzybia
(Reg. No. 32,601)

Date: 12 Jan 2000

P.O. Box 7131
Chicago, IL 60680-7131

(312) 240-0824

A